

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 03/30/2004

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/802,577		03/08/2001	Joseph Damon Beaven	LE9-00-081	7775	
21972	7590	03/30/2004		EXAMINER		
LEXMAR	K INTER	NATIONAL, INC.	VU, KIEU D			
INTELLEC	TUAL PR	OPERTY LAW DEF	PARTMENT			
740 WEST NEW CIRCLE ROAD				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
BLDG. 082	-1			2173		
LEXINGTO	N. KY 4	10550-0999				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4

•				α		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/802,577	BEAVEN ET AL.	/		
Office Actio	n Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Kieu D Vu	2173			
The MAILING DA Period for Reply	TE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence add	ress		
A SHORTENED STATUTHE MAILING DATE OF Extensions of time may be avaidafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the fit the period for reply specified of the period for reply is specified. If NO period for reply is specified. Failure to reply within the set of	d above, the maximum statutory period extended period for reply will, by statute a later than three months after the mailin	136(a). In no event, however, may by within the statutory minimum of will apply and will expire SIX (6) No. e, cause the application to become	y a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. MONTHS from the mailing date of this core ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.		
Status						
1) Responsive to cor	mmunication(s) filed on 29 E	December 2003.				
2a) ☐ This action is FIN.	AL. 2b)⊠ This	s action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the						
closed in accorda	nce with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 (C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims						
4a) Of the above of 5) ☐ Claim(s) is 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is a 7) ☐ Claim(s) is 6.	re rejected.	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is	s objected to by the Examine	er.				
10) The drawing(s) file	d on is/are: a)☐ acc	cepted or b) objected	to by the Examiner.			
	equest that any objection to the					
· · · ·		•	ing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFF ned Office Action or form PTC			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119					
a) All b) Some 1. Certified co 2. Certified co 3. Copies of the application	pies of the priority document pies of the priority document	ts have been received. ts have been received in prity documents have be nu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n Application No en received in this National S	tage		
Attachment/s\						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🗍 Intervie	w Summary (PTO-413)			
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Pat 3) Information Disclosure State Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2. 	ent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper	No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-	152)		

Application/Control Number: 09/802,577

Art Unit: 2173

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 7, 12, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Suzuki (USP 6549947).

Regarding claims 7, 12, and 16, Suzuki teaches an operating system for managing data in a computer, comprising the generating a GUI for a printer for interfacing between a host processor of the computer and a user (column 1, lines 46-49); a data module containing an operating code for causing the printer to execute a predetermined action responsive to a computer command initiated at the GUI (Fig. 1, column 6, lines 38-43); and a conflict dialog module coupled to the data module and having a list of conflicts, the data module causing the conflict dialog module to generate a conflict (error) from the list of conflicts responsive to a selected predetermined action to be executed by the host processor (col 2, lines 6-8; col 5, lines 52-64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 09/802,577

Art Unit: 2173

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-15, and 16-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki and Sieffert (USP5630101).

Regarding claims 1 and 20, Suzuki teaches an operating system for managing data in a computer, comprising the generating a GUI for a printer for interfacing between a host processor of the computer and a user (column 1, lines 46-49); a data module containing an operating code for causing the printer to execute a predetermined action responsive to a computer command initiated at the GUI (Fig. 1, column 6, lines 38-43); and a conflict dialog module coupled to the data module and having a list of conflicts, the data module causing the conflict dialog module to generate a conflict (error) from the list of conflicts responsive to a selected predetermined action to be executed by the host processor (col 2, lines 6-8; col 5, lines 52-64). Sieffert does not teach that the modification does not affect the list of conflicts. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Sieffert. Sieffert teaches an imaging system in which each component is a discrete software object a "black box" (col 9, lines 50-61) such that each component can be modified or replaced without affecting the performance of the others (see Fig. 1; line 60 of col 2, to line 20 of col 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Suzuki and Sieffert before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the printing system taught by Suzuki to include black box design taught by Sieffert so that each component of the system can be modified or redesigned with minimized impact to the overall system (Sieffert, col 3, lines 13-20)

Page 4

Art Unit: 2173

Regarding claims 2-4, 8-11, 13-15, 17-19, 21-24, in Sieffert, modification of one component does not affect other components (col 3, lines 13-20).

Regarding claim 5, Suzuki teaches at least one peripheral device (printer 3) is coupled to the host processor 1 (Fig. 1).

Regarding claims 6 and 25, Suzuki teaches that the one peripheral device is a printer 3 (see Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 26, Suzuki and Sieffert do not teach that the device is a copy machine. However, since both printer and copy machine are used in reproduction environment, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Suzuki and Sieffert method in a copy machine with the motivation being to apply the use of independent modification in a copy machine.

- 5. Applicant's arguments filed 12/29/03 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kieu D. Vu whose telephone number is (703-605-1232). The examiner can normally be reached on Mon Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached on (703- 308-3116).

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)-872-9306

and / or:

JOHN CABECA

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Application/Control Number: 09/802,577

Art Unit: 2173

(703)-746-5639 (use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal paper / amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions)

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703-305-3900).

Kieu D. Vu

03/19/04